# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/975,286 | 10/10/2001 | Christopher Peiffer | 1014-152US01 | 9849 |

|  |  |
|---|---|
| 7590     08/30/2006 | EXAMINER |
| Kent J. Sieffert | PATEL, HARESH N |
| Shumaker & Sieffert, P.A. | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2154 | |

Kent J. Sieffert
Shumaker & Sieffert, P.A.
Suite 105
8425 Seasons Parkway
St. Paul, MN 55125

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| **Office Action Summary** | 09/975,286 | PEIFFER, CHRISTOPHER |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Haresh Patel | 2154 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 June 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7,8 and 11-26* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5, 7, 8, 11-26* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *24 and 25* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-26 are subject to examination.  Claims 6, 9, 10 are cancelled.

### *Response to Arguments*

2.      Applicant's arguments filed 6/23/2006, pages 7-14, have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.  Therefore, rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-26 is maintained.

Applicant argues (1), "Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to the extent such

rejections may be considered applicable to the claims as amended".

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments.  The claimed

have been amended along with newly presented limitations, please see the claims, which is

addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection (please refer to the below rejections of this office

action).  Therefore, the rejection is maintained.



Applicant argues (2), "Branstad is related to sender computes an authentication tag that is

communicated along with a message to a receiver, Branstad teaches using a bitwise XOR

function to computer the tag at the sender or receiver, the sender computes an authentication tag,

Bradstad explains that the KR5 cyptographic technique uses XOR operations and rotations to

computer the authentication tag from the message, ..., using the same mechanism", "Fielding

describes the HTTP protocol, the parameters and headers used when communication via the

HTTP protocol, Branstad and Fielding fail to teach applying a bitwise XOR operation between

two different messages when determining whether the strings match", "The Branstad is applying

XOR operations to different data words of the same message, The examiner suggests Branstad

compares two strings by comparing message content with or without errors, "Smith does not

teach or suggest performing a bitwise operation between a predefined flag and a result of the

exclusive OR operation, and then comparing the predetermined flag and a result of the bitwise

OR operation to produce an indication for the case insensitive string match", "there is no

motivation to combine the teachings for the claimed comparing of the strings, please see claim

1".

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. First, the

teachings of the cited references are not limited as mentioned above by the applicant. The cited

reference each disclose the respective relied upon limiations. The claim has been amended along

with newly presented limitations, which is addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection (please

refer to the below rejections of this office action). The claimed invention, please see claimed

limitations of the claim 1, which is related to the applicant arguments, is **not limited** to either

implemented at a sender or receiver, whether a message can contain predefined string in the

message itself or not, whether authentication tag can or cannot be considered for one and/or both

of the strings of the claim, whether the claimed comparing of two strings can be used for a

cyptographic technique or not, whether the HTTP protocol can utilize the comparing of the two

strings or not, whether the two strings of the claimed invention is part of the same message or

not, etc.

**In fact**, the specification of the case under prosecution, at page 16, lines 12-21 clearly

states, "While the present invention has been particularly shown and described with reference to

the foregoing preferred embodiments, those skilled in the art will understand that many

vatiations may be made therein without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention as

defined in the following claims. The description of the invention should be understood to indude

all novel and nonobvious combinations of elements described herein, and claims may be

presented in this or a later application to any novel and nonobvious combination of these

elements".

The applicant's interpretation that the examiner suggests Branstad compares two strings

by comparing message content with or without errors is a misinterpretation, because the message

content is not compared with or without errors, but two strings are compared. One of the string

that is used for the comparison may or may not contain error.

For the concern that "Smith does not teach or suggest performing a bitwise operation

between a predefined flag and a result of the exclusive OR operation, and then comparing the

predetermined flag and a result of the bitwise OR operation to produce an indication for the case

insensitive string match", all these limitations are not rejected using the Smith reference. In fact,

the claim have been amended along with newly presented limitations, please see the claims,

which is addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection (please refer to the below rejections of this

office action).

Regarding the applicant's concern for the motivation to combine the teachings of the

cited reference, for the claimed comparing of the strings, the applicant is further kindly requested

to refer the disclosure of Rob Saccoccio, "Case insensitive compare when getting environment

headers", Wed, 6, Jun 2001, Chelsea.net, pages 1 and 2, (Hereinafter Rob-Saccoccio); Eric Sit,

"Case insensitive compare when getting environment headers", Mon, 4, Jun 2001, pages 1 and 2,

(Hereinafter Eric-Sit) and Smith et al., U. S. Publication 2005/0246716, Microsoft Corporation,

paragraphs, 28768, 28759, 19857, 19860-19864, 19874-19899, 68, 77, 14441, 14435, 20109-

20115, 22, 30552, 29045-29045.

Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the

examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter.  Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

### *Claim Objections*

3.　　Claims 24 and 25 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 24 should contain --:-- after "the method comprising".

Claim 25 should contain --:-- after "HTTP header by".

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.　　Claims 1, 24, 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitations, "the predetermined flag", "the case-insensitive string

match".  There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim (Please see MPEP

706.03(d).

Claim 24 recites the limitations, "the unknown string".  There is insufficient antecedent

basis for this limitation in the claim (Please see MPEP 706.03(d).

Claim 25 recites the limitations, "the predefined string", "the unknown string". There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim (Please see MPEP 706.03(d).

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
requirements of this title.

5.      Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed

to non-statutory subject matter.

6.      Claims 1-26 contain comparing that do not produce a tangible result. Comparing alone is

not producing a tangible result. It's not until the result of the comparison is used in a disclosed

practical application or at least made available for use in a disclosed practical application that it

becomes a tangible result, which enables any usefulness of having done the comparison to be

realized (please see the claimed subject matter of claims 1-26). The steps of the claims (body of

the claims) need hardware to perform the steps. Further claim 25 claims a computer networking

device, however, the body of the claim, i.e., lines 4-10 of the claim 25 contain method/process

steps.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

7.      The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.        Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Branstad in view of Fielding, Smith et al., 6,377,991 (Hereinafter Smith) and

"Official Notice".

9.        As per claim 1, Branstad discloses a computer-implemented method for comparing (e.g.,

col., 21, lines 21 – 27, col., 3, lines 35 – 48) an unknown string (e.g., string with or without

errors, figure 12, col., 3, lines 9 - 39) to a string (e.g., col., 3, lines 26 – 38), the method

comprising:

        identifying a string (e.g., col., 3, lines 26 – 38);

        identifying an unknown string for comparison with the string (e.g., col., 3, lines 35 – 48);

        performing a bitwise exclusive OR operation (e.g., col., 22, lines 2 – 21, col., 21, lines 21

– 27, col., 3, lines 35 – 48) on a segment of the unknown string (e.g., col., 19, lines 19 – 34) and

a segment of the string (e.g., col., 20, lines 18 – 27) ; and

        identifying string match based on the exclusive OR operation (e.g., col., 22, lines 2 – 21).

        Bradstad also discloses exclusive OR operation between the two strings (e.g., block 1756,

block 1760, figure 17B) and a result of the exclusive OR operation (e.g., col., 22, lines 2-21,

figure 17B, note: it is also inherent that an exclusive OR operation produces a result).

        However, Branstad does not specifically mention about usage of strings having an ASCII

binary representation and string being a case-insensitive string.

        Fielding discloses well-known usage of strings having an ASCII (e.g., section 3.4, page

4) binary representation (e.g., section 14.15, page 16) and string being a case-insensitive string

(e.g., section 3.4, page 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Branstad with the teachings of Fielding in order to

facilitate usage of strings having an ASCII binary representation and string being a case-

insensitive string because the ASCII binary representation would help support communicating

information among two entities using the ASCII character set. The case-insensitive

implementation would support usage of characters regardless of their uppercase or lowercase.

Branstad and Fielding do not specifically mention about applying a predefined flag to the

result and to produce an indication.

However, Smith discloses the well-known concept applying a predefined flag to the

result and to produce an indication (e.g., col., 15, lines 17 – 62, figures 3, 5-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Branstad and Fielding with the teachings of Smith in order

to facilitate usage of applying a predefined flag to the result and to produce an indication because

the predefined flag would support deciding what the result value is from the possible result

values of the result. The indication would enhance supporting the communicating information,

as it would provide information on whether the string match has occurred or not.

Branstad, Fielding and Smith do disclose the string being predefined, performing a

bitwise operation between the predefined flag and the result and comparing the predetermined

flag and a result of the bitwise operation.

"Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing usage of the

string being predefined, performing a bitwise operation between the predefined flag and the

result and comparing the predetermined flag and a result of the bitwise operation is well known

and expected in the art. For example, Rob Saccoccio, "Case insensitive compare when getting environment headers", Wed, 6, Jun 2001, Chelsea.net, pages 1 and 2, (Hereinafter Rob-Saccoccio) discloses these limitations along with clear motivation to overcome HTTP 1.1 specification with a fix for a need for case insensitive compare for the HTTP headers, please see page 1. Eric Sit, "Case insensitive compare when getting environment headers", Mon, 4, Jun 2001, pages 1 and 2, (Hereinafter Eric-Sit) discloses these limitations along with clear motivation to overcome HTTP 1.1 specification with a fix for a need for case insensitive compare for the environment strings, please see pages 1 and 2. Smith et al., U. S. Publication 2005/0246716, Microsoft Corporation, also discloses these limitations, please see paragraphs, 28768, 28759, 19857, 19860-19864, 19874-19899, 68, 77, 14441, 14435, 20109-20115, 22, 30552, 29045-29045.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include usage of the string being predefined, the a bitwise operation between the predefined flag and the result and comparing the predetermined flag and a result of the bitwise operation with the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate the bitwise operation and the comparison because the bitwise operation and the comparison would provide further comparison of the value of the strings (including predefined string) that are used for the bitwise operation and the comparison. The operations on the strings that are used for comparison would provide whether a case-insensitive match is occurred or not among the strings.

10.     As per claim 2, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above.  Branstad also discloses the following:

identifying a segment of the predefined string (e.g., col., 20, lines 18 – 27) and identifying a segment of the unknown string (e.g., col., 19, lines 19 – 34) for comparison (e.g., col., 3, lines 35 – 48) with the predefined string (e.g., col., 20, lines 18 – 27).

11.     As per claims 3, 20, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above.  Branstad also discloses the following:

the segment of the predefined string and the segment of the unknown string contain a same number of characters, the lengths of each of the strings are equal (e.g., col., 3, lines 35 – 48).

12.     As per claim 5, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above.  Fielding also discloses usage of a case-insensitive (e.g., section 3.4, page 4) segment match (e.g., section 14.16, page 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate usage of a case-insensitive segment match because the segment and would help support communicating information among two entities using the ASCII character set.  The case-insensitive implementation would support usage of characters regardless of their uppercase or lowercase.

13.     As per claim 8, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected

above.  Branstad also discloses usage identifying a subsequent segment of the predefined string

(e.g., col., 20, lines 18 – 27) and a subsequent segment of the unknown string (e.g., col., 19, lines

19 – 34) for comparison (e.g., col., 3, lines 35 – 48).


14.     As per claims 14-17, 19, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as

rejected above.  Fielding also discloses the segments each include one character (e.g., section

14.2, page 2) / four characters (e.g., section 14.19, page 19, section 14.23, page 21), the unknown

string including an HTTP header field (e.g., section, 14.1, page 1), the predefined string is from a

table of predetermined HTTP header fields (e.g., section 14, page 1, section 14.1, page 1, section

14.2, page 2), identifying the length of strings (e.g., section 14.13, page 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate each of

the segments each include one character / four characters, the unknown string including an

HTTP header field, the predefined string is from a table of predetermined HTTP header fields

and identifying the length of strings because the character / four characters, HTTP header field,

predetermined HTTP header field and the length of strings would enhance communicating

information among two entities using the ASCII character set.  The case-insensitive

implementation would support usage of characters regardless of their uppercase or lowercase.


15.     As per claims 22 and 23, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as

rejected above.  Fielding also discloses determining if characters of the strings are within a

predefined ASCII range (e.g., section 14.24, page 22, section 14.27, page 25), characters not within the predefined ASCII range causes to yield a negative string match (e.g., section 14.26, page 24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate determining if characters of the strings are within a predefined ASCII range and characters not within the predefined ASCII range causes to yield a negative string match because usage of the determination of characters within a predefined ASCII range and the negative string would enhance communicating information among two entities using the ASCII character set. The case-insensitive implementation would support usage of characters regardless of their uppercase or lowercase.

16.    As per claim 4, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Branstad also discloses left-shifting the content of the segments if the segments contain less than predetermined number of string contents (e.g., col., 22, lines 3 – 39).

However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about shifting when less than four characters exist.

"Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing usage of shifting when less than four characters exist is well known and expected in the art. For example, Thinkage GCOS8 SS C Reference Manual, pages 1-71, 1996, discloses usage of these limitations, e.g., section, 2.7, page 6, section, 4.7, page 34, section, 4.12, page 36.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the well-known concept of shifting when less than four characters with the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate shifting when less than four characters exist because the shifting would enhance supporting decoding information. The compared information would be used for utilizing the string information.

17.     As per claims 7 and 13, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about predetermined value 0x20202020. For example, Abgrall et al., 2003/0037237, discloses the concept of using predetermined value 0x20202020 (0x20 for each byte), e.g., paragraphs 323 and 324.

"Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing predetermined value 0x20202020 is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the well-known concept of providing predetermined value 0x20202020 with the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate using value 0x20202020 (as the predetermined value 0x20202020 represents four blank characters) would enhance supporting decoding information. The compared information would be used for utilizing the string information.

18.     As per claim 12, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about predetermined value 0x20.

"Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing predetermined value 0x20 is well known and expected in the art. For example, Abgrall et al., 2003/0037237, discloses the concept of using predetermined value 0x20, e.g., paragraphs 323 and 324.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the well-known concept of providing predetermined value 0x20 with the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate using value 0x20 (as the predetermined value 0x20 represents blank character) would enhance supporting decoding information. The compared information would be used for utilizing the string information.

19.   As per claims 10, 18, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about the result is operated on in another bitwise operation.

"Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing the result is operated on in another bitwise operation is well known and expected in the art. For example, Kontio et al., 2005/0004875, January 6, 2005, discloses these limitations, e.g., paragraphs 54 and 55.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the well-known concept of providing the result is operated on in another bitwise operation with the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate further operating on the result because the another bitwise operation would enhance supporting decoding information. The compared information would be used for utilizing the string information.

20.     As per claim 11, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected

above. However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about predetermined

value 0.

"Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing

predetermined value 0 is well known and expected in the art. For example, Abgrall et al.,

2003/0037237, discloses the concept of using predetermined value 0, e.g., paragraphs 323 and

324.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to include the well-known concept of providing predetermined value 0 with the

teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate shifting using value 0 (as the

predetermined value 0 represents null value) would enhance supporting decoding information.

The compared information would be used for utilizing the string information.


21.     Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branstad,

Fielding, Smith and "Official Notice" in view of Slater et al., 6,654,796, Cisco (Hereinafter

Slater)

22.      As per claim 21, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as

rejected above. However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about WAN.

Slater discloses the network being WAN (e.g., col., 1, lines 55 – 67, col.,9, lines 42 – 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith with the teachings of Slater

in order to facilitate the network being WAN because the WAN would support communicating

string information from one entity to another entity. The entity over the WAN would support

exclusive OR operation.


23.     Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branstad,

Fielding, Smith and "Official Notice" in view of James et al., 6,523,108 (Hereinafter James).


24.     As per claim 24, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected

above. Branstad also discloses the following:

     use in a computer network (e.g., col., 1, lines 36 – 54, col., 3, lines 21 - 34) and

     the corresponding characters (e.g., col., 10, lines 9 – 34).

     However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about performing OR

operation.

     James discloses the well-known concept of performing the bitwise OR operation (usage

of logical OR gate 117).

     It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith with the teachings of James

in order to facilitate usage of performing the bitwise OR operation because the bitwise OR

operation would enhance deciding whether both the bits are having a value of "1" or not. The

outcome of the bitwise OR operation i.e., "1" or "0" or would enhance informing for the string

that would help support communicating information between two entities.

25.　　As per claim 25, Branstad, Fielding, Smith and James disclose the claimed limitations as

rejected above. Branstad also discloses the following:

a computer networking device for improving data transfer via a computer network (e.g.,

col., 1, lines 36 – 54, col., 3, lines 21 - 34).

26.　　As per claim 26, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected

above. Branstad also discloses the following:

an article of manufacture comprising a storage medium having a plurality of machine-

readable instructions executed by a computing system (e.g., col., 1, lines 36 – 54, col., 3, lines 21

- 34).

## *Conclusion*

27.　　The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and

not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. For example, Narin,

2002/0091755 discloses usage of number of predefined headers along with supplemental

headers. Brown, 5,740,361, discloses string bits / header authentication using HTTP protocol and

headers like Accept-Encoding, WWW-Authenticate by XORing several times and using, for

example, one-character string "/" for "http://www.foo.com" string over the Internet.

Mitzenmacher et al., 5,953,503, discloses HTTP headers with ASCII characters with preset

dictionaries.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or

sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the

convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings

of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages

and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing

responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the

claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by

the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973.  The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to

8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964.  The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.  Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.  Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only.  For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Haresh Patel*

Haresh Patel

August 28, 2006